

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 14, 26-28, and 30-42 are pending in this application. Claims 12, 13, 15-25 and 29 were previously canceled, and claim 36 is canceled herein. Claims 39-42 are added, and claims 1-5, 9, 26, 35, and 37 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowance of claims 7-11, 14 and 34-38.

The previous objections to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) have been maintained. Further, Applicants' replacement drawings for Figures 4D and 4E were deemed unacceptable as contradictory to the specification. Appropriate correction is made herein. In particular, the further layer of resist over the ring of resist is not patterned. Figure 4D has been amended, Figure 4E has been relabeled as Figure 4F, and a new Figure 4E has been added to show the further layer of resist. The specification has been amended to reflect these changes and corrected drawings are submitted herewith. The drawings are now consistent with the specification.

Applicants request Examiner to withdraw the objections.

Claims 7 and 9 were objected to for various informalities. Appropriate correction is made herein. In particular, claim 9 has been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 has proper antecedent basis (see preamble of claim 7). Applicants request Examiner to withdraw the objections.

Claims 1 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 1 and 26 have been amended in view of Examiner's rejections. More specifically, claim 1 has been amended to define the devices as

semiconductor devices and to define the relationship of the bottom surface to the top surface of the wafer as opposite each other. Claim 26 has been amended to clarify that the ring is *deposited directly* onto the periphery region without a lithographic step. Applicant requests Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

Claims 26, 28, 30, 32 and 33, in so far as definite, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Holscher, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,076 B1, hereinafter “Holscher”). Claim 27, in so far as definite, has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holscher in view of Nakayama, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,291,315 B1, hereinafter “Nakayama”).

Claim 26, as currently amended, specifically recites “wherein the ring is deposited directly onto the periphery region without a lithographic step.” This is taught in the original disclosure in paragraph [0023]. This limitation is not taught or suggested by Holscher. Rather, Holscher teaches using a photo lithographic technique to pattern the resist layer. See, for example, Figure 4. Hence, independent claim 26 is allowable.

Claims 27, 28, 30, 31, 32 and 33 depend from claim 26 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 31, in so far as definite, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holscher in view of Wolf (Silicon Processing, Vol. 1, hereinafter “Wolf”). Claim 2, in so far as definite, has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holscher in view of Wolf and in view of Nakayama.

Claim 1, as currently amended, specifically recites “ patterning the resist layer over the inner region of the wafer, wherein the resist layer over the ring is not patterned.” This limitation

includes an allowed limitation from claim 7. Holscher, either singly or in combination with Nakayama or Wolf, does not teach or suggest patterning the resist layer from over the inner region but not from over the ring of organic material. Rather, Holscher does not teach a resist layer over the ring. Neither Wolf nor Nakayama cures this deficiency. Hence, independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-6, and new claim 39, depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

New claim 40 specifically recites "forming at least one patterned region within said inner device region of said wafer, wherein the further layer of resist atop said ring of positive resist layer is not patterned." This limitation includes an allowed limitation from claim 7. Holscher does not teach or suggest patterning the further resist layer from over the inner device region but not from over the ring of organic material. None of the other prior art of record cures this deficiency. Hence, independent claim 40 is allowable.

New claims 41 and 42 depend from claim 40 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ira S. Matsil, Applicants' attorney, at 972-732-1001, so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

01/16/08



Ira S. Matsil
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 35,272

Slater & Matsil, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252-5793
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218